

STCG TANK SUBGROUP MEETING MINUTES

August 13, 1997

Welcome/Introductions (Cathy Louie)

Cathy Louie welcomed the group. She mentioned a new HTI video with Jackson Kinzer interviewing several vendors and then showing their cold technology demonstrations. She requested time on the agenda to show the video at the STCG Management Council meeting on August 20. Cathy also stated that TWRS is experiencing a budget crunch and HTI has fallen just below the line. TWRS is trying hard to find funding for it.

There is no direct near-term impact of cutting the funding for HTI, since the retrieval and closure milestones are farther out in the future. It is arguable whether HTI is on the TWRS Program's critical path or not. It is clearly important for single-shell tank retrieval. Cathy agreed to prepare a draft letter of support for HTI for Management Council endorsement.

John LaFemina reported that he has taken a new assignment as the line manager for all PNNL research groups in the 325 Building, so he will not be able to work with the STCG anymore. Bill Bonner will assume John's role with the Subgroup on tank science and technology needs. John's TFA work will be handled by Bill Kuhn. Cathy thanked John for driving the tank science needs process last year.

Andrea McMakin introduced herself as the new public involvement/communications person for HTI. She will be attending Tank Subgroup meetings now.

Subgroup Member Survey Responses (Tom Tebb)

At the last Subgroup meeting, we decided to send out a survey regarding Subgroup attendance. Copies of the responses received to date were distributed at this meeting. Members were asked to review the comments and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting. If you have not responded to the survey, please do so. Your input will help us make the meetings more useful to our members.

FDH Technology Demonstration/Deployment Fact Sheets (Paul Scott)

The purpose of these fact sheets is to document what FDH has done to meet its performance agreements. The intent of discussing the fact sheets at this meeting was to hear concerns and gather input on any changes that are needed. Comments will be recorded, by not reconciled, and they will be used to plan for these technologies. The performance agreement requires STCG Subgroup review, but not endorsement. Tom and Cathy requested another week to review the fact sheets. Members were asked to submit their comments in writing by August 20, focusing mainly on the content, not the format or the grammar.

Nancy Uziemblo asked what FDH is doing besides putting out fact sheets. She asked if they are speeding up technology deployment by bridging the gap between demonstration and deployment.

Dirk Dunning asked who the audience is for the fact sheets. He said that some of them are too technical for the general public. Paul Scott stated that the fact sheets will serve both internal and external audiences (e.g., Senator Bliley).

Level Zero TWRS Logic (Jim Honeyman)

The TWRS Program logic is broken into four zones:

- Safe Storage
- Phase 1 Privatization
- Phase 2 Privatization
- Closure

The focus today is on Phase 1 activities in order to get the feed to the vendors by June 1, 2002. Two LAW plants and one HLW plant are supposed to be ready for hot operations on that date. The TWRS EIS Record of Decision commits DOE to re-evaluate their strategy:

- prior to Phase 1E
- prior to the start of hot operations in Phase 1
- prior to proceeding with Phase 2.

Mid-Level Logic for TWRS LAW and HLW Programs (Tom Crawford and Mike O'Neill)

TWRS engineers are currently breaking down each box in the logic diagrams into activities that need to be done. Once these activities are described, they can identify where technology needs exist. About 500 activities have been identified so far, ranging from \$50K activities to \$5-10M activities.

There are almost no parallel path activities in the TWRS Program now. However, Harry Boston (LMHC) is trying to identify parallel paths where high risks are perceived and doing Monte Carlo analyses to incorporate them.

DOE must give one tank to each vendor for feed staging. These tanks will have LAW waste in them, but not the waste the vendors have to process. No spare double-shell tanks are available. The vendors want the integrity of these two tanks certified, and DOE needs a cheaper technology for doing this. The current baseline technology for certification would cost \$715K. HLW will be pumped directly to the vitrification plant, with no feed staging tank involved, mainly because the volume of HLW is so much lower than the volume of LAW waste.

FY98 Tank Technology Needs (Paul Scott)

Paul described the process used to develop the list of technology needs this year. Last year's list was taken to the TWRS project managers to see if the needs are still relevant. Paul produced a table showing: the technology need number, title, FY97 STCG priority, and FY98 TWRS manager's priority. The group was asked to fill in the column for the FY98 STCG priority. There was only enough time to complete discussions and record comments on the following seven needs:

- Char 3 - Larger Sample Hot Cell DSC/TGA Based Energetics Measurement
- Char 4 - Technetium-99 Analysis in Low Level Waste Feed
- Char 5 - Rapid Speciation of Organic Acids and Complexants
- Char 7 - In-Tank Core Sampling...Off-Riser Capability
- Char 8 - Large-Volume (3-5 Liter) Sludge and Supernate Sampler
- Op 1 - Corrosion Probe Development
- Op 2 - Remote Inspection of High-Level Waste Tanks

Wrap-Up and Decision on How to Proceed with the Needs Process (Facilitator)

The Subgroup decided to meet on August 21 to complete the FY98 technology needs assessment process.

Action Items

1. Cathy Louie and Paul Scott will draft a letter of support from the Subgroup for HTI by August 20 for STCG Management Council endorsement. Let Linda Fassbender know if you would like to review/comment on this letter before it is sent to EM-30 (Mark Frei) and EM-50 (Gerald Boyd).
2. Send Linda Fassbender your written comments on the FDH technology demonstration and deployment fact sheets by August 20.
3. Any additional tank technology needs should be written up in the standard template format and submitted to Paul Scott by August 22.
4. All technology needs require the following improvements:
 - a. More description of the functional performance requirements.
 - b. Under Technical Justification, discuss risks and tie the need to the TWRS Program logic.

Meeting Attendees

John Appel (LMHC)
Gary Ballew (PREC)
Bill Bonner (PNNL)
Dennis Brown (DOE/STP)
Pam Brown (HAB)
Tom Crawford (LMHC)
Dirk Dunning (Oregon Office of Energy)
Linda Fassbender (PNNL)
Vince Fitzpatrick (MACTEC)
Tom Frater (FDH)
Pete Gibbons (NHC)
Jim Honeyman (LMHC)
Cathy Louie (DOE/TWRS)
Todd Martin (HAB) - by phone
Andrea McMakin (PNNL)
Mike O'Neill (MACTEC)
Paul Scott (FDH/Technology Management)
Steve Seeman (LMHC)
Tom Tebb (Ecology)
Nancy Uziemblo (Ecology)

Next Meeting

The next regular Tank Subgroup meeting will be held on September 10, 1997 from 1:00-5:00 p.m. in the ISB-1 White Bluffs Room. The following future agenda items were identified:

- tank technology needs
- horizontal drilling vendor proposal
- Tom's survey results
- identification of tank problems to be addressed by the Subgroup
- benefits of Numatec's winning TDI proposal
- Subgroup roles and responsibilities
- TWRS budget/HTI endorsement letter
- major concerns or show-stoppers on the FDH technology demonstration/deployment fact sheets